

5613

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was not written for publication and is not binding precedent of the Board.

Paper No. 12

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte JIE LIANG,
STEPHEN HSIAO-YI LI,
RAJENDRA K. TALLURI,
FRANK L. LACZKO, SR.
and
Y. PAUL CHIANG

Appeal No. 2000-1205
Application 09/089,290

ON BRIEF

MAILED

APR 10 2002

**PAT. & T.M. OFFICE
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Before HAIRSTON, JERRY SMITH, and BARRY, Administrative Patent Judges.

HAIRSTON, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is an appeal from the final rejection of claims 1 through 5.

The disclosed invention relates to a method of decoding video containing predicted frames.

Appeal No. 2000-1205
Application No. 09/089,290

Claim 1 is the only independent claim on appeal, and it reads as follows:

1. A method of decoding video containing predicted frames, comprising the steps of:

(a) for at least one predicted frame decoding a first macroblock at a first resolution and decoding a second macroblock at a second resolution greater than said first resolution.

The reference relied on by the examiner is:

Boyce et al. (Boyce) 5,635,985 June 3, 1997

Claims 1 through 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Boyce.

Reference is made to the brief (paper number 10) and the answer (paper number 11) for the respective positions of the appellants and the examiner.

OPINION

For all of the reasons expressed by the examiner (answer, pages 3 through 6), claims 1 through 5 are anticipated by the decoder and the picture-in-picture (P-I-P) teachings of Boyce (Figures 1, 2A, 2B and 4; column 17, line 66 through column 18, line 60).

The examiner has correctly concluded (answer, pages 3 through 5) that the claimed invention is not limited to "a" predicted frame as argued by appellants (brief, page 3). We

Appeal No. 2000-1205
Application No. 09/089,290

agree with the examiner that the claimed "at least one predicted frame" is broad enough to read on two different predicted P frames in Boyce. Accordingly, the claimed invention reads on the decoding of a first macroblock in one of the reduced resolution decoders 402 or 403 (Figure 4), and the decoding of a second macroblock in the full resolution decoder 401. Obviously, the second or full resolution is greater than the first or reduced resolution.

Based upon appellants' grouping of the claims (brief, page 3), the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1 through 5 is sustained.

DECISION

The decision of the examiner rejecting claims 1 through 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is affirmed.

Appeal No. 2000-1205
Application No. 09/089,290


No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 CFR § 1.136(a).

AFFIRMED

~~Kenneth W. Hairston~~
KENNETH W. HAIRSTON
Administrative Patent Judge

Jerry Smith
JERRY SMITH
Administrative Patent Judge

BOARD OF PATENT
APPEALS AND
INTERFERENCES


LANCE LEONARD BARRY
Administrative Patent Judge

KWH:svt

Appeal No. 2000-1205
Application No. 09/089,290

Carlton H. Hoel
Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265